

Attorney Docket No. SMIN-00100

Remarks

Reconsideration of the claims as amended are respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-13, 18 and 19 are pending.

New Claims 20, 21 have been added. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended. No new matter has been added, and support for these new claims find support on pages 26 and 27 of the application as filed.

Arguments

Independent Claims 1 and 6 have been amended such that they now include the further limitation of using a "selective line readout" for data acquisition. The amendment is based by combining previous claims 1 and 2 and by combining claims previous 6 and 7, respectively.

Amended claim 1 now discloses a system comprising an imaging sub-system which uses selective line readout instead of completely imaging the whole eye to determine the eye position. The cited prior art does not disclose or suggest anything comparable to this feature, and there is no particular or obvious incentive or common sense understanding for the skilled person in the prior art to apply such a feature.

The usage of selective lines readout is an advantageous improvement of the prior art systems, because it overcomes the problem of large latency due to large transmission time for transmission of the relatively large complete eye images between the system components for each new eye position measurement. The time for measuring the actual eye position using selective line readout is shorter than with the complete imaging and therefore the latency can be reduced, thereby improving the efficiency of the high speed tracking. Thus, allowance of amended claims 1 and 6 are respectfully requested.

Amended claim 2 requires that the lines used for selective line readout are selected by picking up the lines with the highest probability to be located on the tracked landmark. This makes it possible to choose the lines such that a high efficiency of the data acquisition for tracking purposes can be achieved, thereby also reducing the latency.

Attorney Docket No. SMIN-00100

This is also not at all suggested by the cited prior art. The subject-matter of new Claim 2 (and likewise new claim 7) therefore is not rendered obvious by the cited prior art and should be considered to be novel and non-obvious. Accordingly, allowance of Claims 2 and 7 are respectfully requested.


The above claims are respectfully submitted for consideration by the examiner for patentable subject matter in the invention and the invention's equivalents. No new matter has been added. It is also submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance, which is requested herein.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2421.

If there are any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact the undersigned at (408) 288-7588.

Sincerely,

Dated: October 18, 2007



David R. Stevens
Registration No. 38,626

Stevens Law Group
P.O. Box 1667
San Jose, CA 95109
Phone (408) 288-7588
Fax (408) 288-7542